

MAY - 6 1998

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

In the Matter of)
) CC Docket No. 92-77
Billed Party Preference for)
InterLATA 0+ Calls)

AT&T Comments on Petitions for Reconsideration

AT&T Corp. ("AT&T") submits the following comments on the petitions for reconsideration of the Second Report and Order and Order on Reconsideration, FCC 98-9, released January 29, 1998 and published in the Federal Register on March 10, 1998 ("Second Report").¹

AT&T supports the requests for reconsideration of the implementation schedule established in the Second Report.² AT&T agrees that introduction of new systems and capabilities by operator services providers ("OSPs") could take substantially more than the few months provided for in the Commission's order.³ Moreover, as the Joint Commenters

¹ Petitions were filed by Ameritech, AT&T, Bell Atlantic, BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. ("BellSouth"); Citizens United for Rehabilitation of Errants ("C.U.R.E."); Cleartel Communications, Inc., Operator Service Company and Teltrust Communications Services, Inc. (collectively "Joint Commenters"); Inmate Calling Service Providers Coalition; One Call Communications, Inc. ("Opticom") and U S WEST.

² Joint Commenters, pp. 4-15; Opticom, p. 3. See also Ameritech, p. 17; BellSouth, p. 3; U S WEST, p. 9.

³ AT&T (n.2) indicated that it too will need additional time to comply with the requirements of the Second Report and that it will apply for a waiver of the July 1, 1998 implementation date.

1. of 10 pages
ABODE

04

(p. 11) state, the Commission has already granted a blanket extension to OSPs that rely on store and forward technology, and it would be discriminatory to require OSPs who also face technical implementation issues to comply with the July 1 date. Past experience indicates that the principal concerns regarding high OSP rates do not result from the actions of larger carriers such as AT&T, but from the practices of smaller OSPs, many of whom rely on store and forward technology.⁴ Thus, AT&T supports the Joint Commenters' request to extend the effective date of the rules for all OSPs to October 1999.

AT&T also supports the numerous petitioners who ask the Commission to clarify that its rules only require OSPs to provide rate information regarding charges for which they will bill.⁵ As AT&T (p. 3) noted, location-specific charges imposed by aggregators vary widely and are generally unknown to OSPs. Thus, AT&T fully concurs with Ameritech's (p. 21) statement that "[t]o the extent that the Commission did not intend to limit this requirement to disclosure of actual or maximum PIFs which an OSP has authorized through contract or

⁴ Indeed, prior proposals to establish "rate benchmarks" suggested that such benchmarks be set at a level above the average of the rates of AT&T, MCI and Sprint.

⁵ Ameritech, pp. 20-21; Bell Atlantic, p. 3; BellSouth, n.7; U S WEST, pp. 10-12. On calls from inmate phones, this would include all surcharges billed by the OSP (see C.U.R.E, pp. 5-6). Moreover, the time taken to offer and provide rate information would not be billable to the called party (id., p. 2).

by billing, Ameritech can say unequivocally that it cannot comply with this requirement."

AT&T also agrees with Bell Atlantic (p. 2) and BellSouth (p. 2) that the Commission should clarify that its erratum does not override the text of the Second Report and extend the OSPs' obligations to calls dialed on a 0- basis. Such an interpretation would be inconsistent with the title of this proceeding. Moreover, 0- interstate calls are typically routed to a LEC operator and then to carrier selected by the caller, not to a carrier chosen by an aggregator.

WHEREFORE, the Commission should reconsider and/or clarify the Second Report in a manner consistent with AT&T's comments herein.

Respectfully submitted,

AT&T CORP.

By



Mark C. Rosenblum
Peter H. Jacoby
Richard H. Rubin

Its Attorneys

Room 325213
295 North Maple Avenue
Basking Ridge, NJ 07920
(908) 221-4481

May 6, 1998

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Rena Martens, do hereby certify that on this 6th day of May, 1998, a copy of the foregoing "AT&T Comments on Petitions for Reconsideration" was served by U.S. first class mail, postage prepaid, to the parties listed below.

Gary L. Phillips
Ameritech
Suite 1020
1401 H Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

John M. Goodman
Michael E. Glover
Bell Atlantic
Telephone Companies
1300 I Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

M. Robert Sutherland
Theodore R. Kingsley
BellSouth Corporation
Suite 1700
1155 Peachtree St., N.E.
Atlanta, GA 30309-3610

Christopher A. Holt
Yaron Dori
Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Ferris,
Glovsky and Popeo, P.C.
701 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004-2608
Attorneys for Citizens United
for Rehabilitation of
Errants

Dana Frix
Kathleen L. Greenan
Swidler & Berlin, Chartered
3000 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20007
Attorneys for ClearTel
Communications, Inc.,
Operator Service Company,
& Teltrust Communications
Services, Inc.

Albert H. Kramer
Robert F. Aldrich
Jacob S. Farber
Dickstein Shapiro Morin &
Oshinsky LLP
2101 L Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20337-1526
Attorneys for Inmate Calling
Services Providers
Coalition

Randall B. Lowe
Piper & Marbury L.L.P.
1200 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
Attorney for One Call
Communications Inc.
d/b/a OPTICOM

Kathryn Marie Krause
Dan L. Poole
U S WEST, INC.
Suite 700
1020 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036


Rena Martens